

April 30, 1975

SENATOR KEYES: In other words, there should be 46 present. Am I right?

PRESIDENT: There are.

SENATOR KEYES: OK, now if there are 46 present, then the majority present voting means that you have to have a majority of the 46 present voting.

PRESIDENT: No, no.

SENATOR KEYES: Yes, it does. I read the book. I can read.

PRESIDENT: No. Turn him off.

CLERK: Your enrolling clerk reports that she did on this day present to the Governor LB 316 and 466. Mr. President, I ask to be excused until I return. Signed Senator Kennedy. Mr. President, I ask to be excused tomorrow at 1:30 p.m.. Signed Senator Clark. Excuse Senator Dworak Thursday afternoon until he returns. Mr. President, Legislative Resolution #36 will be read into the Journal and I suppose referred to the Executive Board for referral. Mr. President, Senator Warner asked to be recognized.

PRESIDENT: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I request a point of personal privilege to explain some sheets...some information I have had passed out. I want to call attention to those of you who look at it that there is a typographical error on the front page that refers to the State Board of Education which should refer to the State Board of Equalization. And I want to point out that the purpose of this handout is to clarify that there are two separate issues which seem to get co-mingled in the discussions relative to income tax rates or state sales and income tax rates for this year and for the coming year. The basis of this information will show to you that probably an increase would be required for 1975 tax year of 2% in the income tax. The reason for that is by virtue of the information that was provided to the State Board of Equalization last November did not include the express obligations or any reference to express obligations as required by statute. This paper will indicate what probably should have been done at that time had that information been included. What the Board voted on with the information which they had, they voted correctly but the information, I don't believe was complete and I would hope that the body would take a chance to read this over because it clearly indicates and separates these two issues which are now co-mingled in the legislation for increased retroactive in the income tax could be enacted at a 2% increase and that will meet the statute requirement and would probably take care of this year, and then when we talk about rates for subsequent sessions, that is a total separate issue and should not be mixed into that bill and that is the purpose of the handout. Also, I want to call attention that on the last page, it indicates one-half of the 75-76 appropriation made by the 74 Legislature and that referred only to capital construction that was enacted at that time.